REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The foregoing amendments are supported by the specification as filed, for example at paragraph [0016]. No new matter is being added by any of the present amendments. Claims 22-33 are being cancelled simply to reduce the number of issued presented for reconsideration.

The Office Action agrees that Calder fails to teach or suggest "redirect code . . . operable to (i) intercept at least one function call made by [an] application process to access secured data associated with [ ] resources of [a] secured computing environment for which access is requested, and (ii) execute at least one [ ] redirect [function] in place of the at least one intercepted function call so as to enable the application process, executing at [a] first computing device, to access the secured data", as claimed. However, the Office Action postulates that because Calder deals with a network of participating client computers it would have been obvious to incorporate the teachings of Graham with respect to the use of a remote database in such a network. This contention is flawed.

Calder is concerned with providing an interception module which precludes unauthorized access of a client computer's resources by an application and unauthorized resources of the application by the client computer. See Calder at paragraph 74. Accordingly, secure data of the client computer is screened off from the executing application. In light of this goal, it is not reasonable to expect that one of ordinary skill in the art would now expose that sensitive data to not just the application executing on the client machine, but also to similar applications running on remote machines. Doing so would defeat the essential purpose of the interception module.

In considering whether or not to reject a patent claim for obviousness in view of a combination of teachings of multiple references, the totality of the prior art must be considered and proceeding contrary to accepted wisdom in the art is evidence of nonobviousness. *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038, 228 USPQ 685 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Here, Calder has describes a system that carefully isolates a client computer from resources available to an application and also isolates that application from data of the client computer. Even if the use of remote databases as taught by Graham were included in such a system, at best this would allow applications on one computer to access data already available to that application but stored on a different computer. It would not expose the sensitive data of one client computer to an application running on another computer. In contrast, the present claims recite systems and methods where that sensitive data associated with a resource of a secured computing environment is made available to an application running on a client computer remote from the secured environment. These are systems and methods that proceed in a fashion contrary to that which would be contrary to the

accepted wisdom of the art (as evidence by Graham) and so supports a conclusion of nonobviousness.

Thomas is cited for teaching features of the dependent claims. Even if this is so, Thomas fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Calder and Graham. Therefore, the claims are patentable over Calder in view of Graham and Thomas.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present claims are patentable over the cited references even when considered in combination with one another.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140 for any deficiencies of fees.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Date: September 15, 2009

/Tarek N. Fahmi/
Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station
Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320